

Minutes, June 15, 2012, meeting of the Marcellus Shale Safe Drilling Initiative Advisory Commission, approved August 20, 2012.

The Commission held its ninth meeting at the auditorium of Garrett College, 687 Mosser Road, McHenry Maryland 21541. In attendance were Chairman David Vanko and Commission members James Raley, William Valentine, Peggy Jamison, Nick Weber, John Fritts, Paul Roberts, Jeff Kupfer, Dominick Murray, Steven Bunker, and Senator George Edwards. Also in attendance were staff of state agencies and members of the public.

The meeting began with a presentation from Jennifer Hains of the Maryland Department of Environment (MDE) Air and Radiation Management Administration (ARMA) on Air Monitoring. ARMA currently has a monitoring site in Western Maryland at Piney Run, to measure the regional transport of ozone and ozone precursors into Maryland. Installation of additional monitoring stations and testing for additional pollutants would be necessary to establish a baseline of local air quality prior to the development of hydraulic fracturing of the Marcellus Shale. Such monitoring would require significant costs for equipment, infrastructure and technical personnel. The terrain of Western Maryland presents challenges to the development of an accurate baseline. Questions were taken on the presentation.

Commissioner Valentine asked how air enters the monitoring equipment and whether air within the monitoring station could affect measurements. Ms. Hains clarified that the sampled air does not mix with air in the building; it flows down a tube into the measuring instruments. The equipment and building are regularly checked for leaks.

Commissioner Weber asked which pollutants would be measured in a baseline study and what levels pose a threat to human health. Brigid Kenney of MDE answered that, at a future meeting, the state will present information about the chemicals associated with gas development and their health effects. She will ask the Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene (DHMH) to participate.

Commissioner Roberts asked about existing sources of air pollution, including wood fired boilers and gas activities in nearby states. Ms. Hains answered that there are currently no requirements to monitor air quality in Western Maryland. To establish background, data would be collected for about a year. This would provide information on existing levels of air pollution. Once gas extraction starts, subsequent monitoring would show whether there had been a change in air quality. Ms. Kenney added that the use of wood burning boilers had been prohibited in Maryland, but that units that meet emission standards are now permitted. Wood smoke is a significant air pollutant in Western Maryland.

A member of the audience asked what health effects have been found in states currently involved in hydraulic fracturing. Ms. Hains answered that there are incomplete data.

Chairman Vanko asked about the West Virginia University (WVU) portable suitcase size Wireless Air Monitoring System mentioned in the presentation and whether WVU could

work in Garrett County. Ms. Kenney answered that Maryland is working on coordinating with other states to get air quality data.

An audience member asked Ms. Kenney about gathering information on the incidence of respiratory problems before and after hydraulic fracking. Ms. Kenney answered that collecting individual medical records is controversial. DHMH is beginning to collect data, but she was not sure of the scope.

Commissioner Weber asked what compounds air quality monitoring stations measure currently in Maryland. Ms. Hains referred to a slide from her presentation that listed the chemicals monitored for at each site. Maryland's monitoring focuses mainly on nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, ozone and particulates and does not generally monitor for toxics or Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs). The Piney Run monitoring station is intended to register pollutant entering Maryland from the west, especially the Ohio Valley.

An audience member commented that dense population should not be the only important factor in determining where to place air monitors. Environmental justice should also be considered. He suggested that MDE contact emergency response agencies, including MEMA, to learn more about their portable monitors.

Commissioner Roberts asked if there are portable monitoring systems in place in Maryland and what the benefits of those systems are. Ms. Hains answered that there are currently no portable monitoring systems in Maryland. The potential benefits depend on what is measured and for what purpose. Commissioner Roberts asked if Maryland monitors methane in the air and why methane is a concern. Ms. Hains answered that Maryland does not have a quantitative system of measuring methane and noted that methane is a more potent greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide.

Ms. Kenney noted that Ms. Hains mentioned in her presentation a device that can detect methane but not measure the amount present. Some people have questioned whether these devices detect methane or merely detect heat or other chemicals. Ms. Hains said that interference is possible and technical personnel must evaluate the context of the measurements and determine what could interfere with the methane detection.

Chairman Vanko asked which compounds are considered VOCs. Is methane a VOC? Ms. Hains said that some chemicals can fall within more than one category. VOCs include compounds such as acetaldehyde, propane, ethane, and formaldehyde. Ms. Hains was not sure of the specific classification of methane. It may be classified as VOC, but separate methods are needed to measure methane compared to other VOCs.

An audience member commented that she is a resident of Garrett County and noted that citizens are concerned about being exposed at all to the pollutants. She asked if there is a plan in place to monitor air quality in Western Maryland, where the funding would come from, and when the study would start. Chairman Vanko answered that this is the process occurring now and the work of the Commission is to address those issues.

An audience member asked if MDE is advocating for background air quality monitoring before gas extraction occurs. Ms. Kenney said it will be difficult to get a background reading representative of the counties because of the terrain. The applicant for a drilling permit might be required to gather background air quality data in the vicinity of the proposed well before any activity could begin. This could represent local background. Commissioner Weber commented that it would be helpful to know the current air pollution levels, not just the regional levels measured at Piney Run.

The next item on the agenda was a presentation from Karen Irons of ARMA on the Regulation of Pollution in Gas Exploration and Production. The presentation included current air pollution regulations, air quality permits and fees in general and then in reference to the gas industry. Ms. Irons also clarified which regulations fall under the control of ARMA and how those regulations are monitored and enforced. Questions were taken on the presentation.

An audience member asked how MDE would know what pollutants to monitor for and about the possibility that unknown pollutants might be emitted. Ms. Irons said it is not easy to get information on pollution sources because emissions can vary depending on the equipment and fuel used. Companies are asked to submit information to MDE on the technologies they use and need to prove that those technologies can comply with air quality standards.

Commissioner Weber commented that the EPA is considering requiring that methane leaks be collected. Ms. Kenney said that EPA regulations have been recently adopted that will require equipment to capture methane at certain stages. The requirement will take effect in 2015. Commissioner Weber asked what EPA and/or MDE are planning to accomplish with emissions standards. Ms. Irons said the goal is to minimize emissions and use best practices. Emissions will not be zero but will be lower than without these best technologies and practices.

Chairman Vanko asked how the air permitting fee and fees for air emissions are determined. Ms. Irons answered that each facility is required to report emissions; the data are reviewed. If emissions go over the limit on the permit, the company/owner of the facility is subject to enforcement action. The company pays for the tons of air pollutants reported. There is no penalty unless the facility exceeds its permit limits. Chairman Vanko commented that while water pollution can sometimes be traced unequivocally to a particular point source, air pollution may more likely to result from the combined effects of multiple sources. Ms. Irons said that although water pollution is easier to sample and quantify, companies have certain equipment and operating requirements designed to limit air pollution, so even if the air pollution is not measured continuously, if the company is complying with those requirements, it is in compliance with the air pollution standards. Temperature and other records need be compiled by the company, so if a company is not complying with maintaining those records, MDE can assume the company is not complying with air quality requirements.

Commissioner Weber asked if Marcellus Shale is drilled, when would MDE visit a site to monitor compliance with regulation, and would MDE come to a site that has experienced an accident. Ms. Irons replied that MDE would come out in the event of an accident and that any facility with an air permit is subject to announced and unannounced inspections by MDE, as well as inspections following up on a complaint. Ms. Irons was not sure how often drill sites would be inspected. At the first couple of sites, more people would probably go out just to get experience with the process. Ms. Kenney commented that a drilling permit is issued by the mining program. It would not be practicable or financially feasible to have an inspector on site 24/7. She said the mining program will check operations and data at appropriate points and those points are not yet known. The mining program can charge a permit fee to cover the cost of inspections. A fee has not been determined yet because we haven't established the requirements or made a determination of how often the inspections will take place.

Commissioner Roberts commented that it doesn't seem feasible to monitor air quality now. Ms. Haines said people need to be trained to use the equipment and interpret results. Commissioner Roberts recommended measuring cumulative impacts. Ms. Kenney noted that the regulatory atmosphere is contentious and there are arguments over whether states or the EPA are in the better position to regulate air pollution. Commissioner Roberts commented that by pushing the effective date of the new EPA regulations to 2015, companies have three more years to continue current practices. Ms. Kenney noted that EPA made the judgment that it is not feasible for industry to comply with the new air quality standards any earlier than 2015.

Commissioner Kupfer asked if an air permit and a drilling permit are both required for each well drilled. Ms. Irons said she thought both permits will be required. Because Maryland is in an ozone transport region and is a nonattainment area for some pollutants, air permits are required for many operations. Commissioner Kupfer asked if the State has drafted any air permits for drilling operations. Ms. Irons said no, not yet.

An audience member asked if there will be a separate refracking permit. Ms. Irons said that if hydraulic fracturing occurs again at the same site, it would probably be classified as modification to an existing air permit.

An audience member asked if compressor stations will be treated individually. Ms. Irons said other states have found that individual compressor stations are not emitting pollutants above the thresholds for permitting, and therefore do not require permits. Under some circumstances, emissions from separate facilities under common control can be aggregated and may then exceed the permitting threshold. As an example, a quarry and a cement plant connected by a conveyor might be considered a single facility. The EPA may mandate aggregation of compressor stations and this would subject more of them to permit requirements. The audience member asked if all the compressor stations in a community could be aggregated. Ms. Irons said Pennsylvania is permitting the stations now and we will soon know whether they will use aggregation. The audience member commented that the wells would be clustered because that is better for the company. Why can't Maryland do something different and be stricter? Ms. Irons said that

the spacing between wells is an issue in some states, but she doesn't know if it will be an issue in Maryland. Ms. Kenney said the Commission will look at the spacing issue. The audience member commented that this is the place to talk about the issue. Commissioner Weber asked how New York has dealt with spacing requirements. Ms. Irons answered that New York is in a different EPA region than Maryland and Maryland has not had much contact with New York about the issue. Ms. Irons said her understanding is that New York has different spacing requirements than Pennsylvania and West Virginia.

Next on the agenda was a presentation from Dr. Keith Eshleman to update the commissioners on the Best Practices study. Dr. Eshleman summarized the progress made on the study and how the best practices are being determined. Questions were taken on the presentation.

Commissioner Kupfer asked whether best management practices (BMPs) will be selected from a compilation of regulations by other states, reports issued by trade groups and environmental organizations and actual industry practices. Dr. Eshleman answered that he is looking at all of those sources. Commissioner Kupfer commented that the fact that another state lists a practice does not necessarily mean that it is a best practice.

Commissioner Kupfer said that his point is that Dr. Eshleman and his team shouldn't blindly determine what is most protective, period, but what will be best practically in the context of development. The inquiry ought to be how best to perform the activities, and that the BMPs had to be practicable. Dr. Eshleman said that the task of his group is to analyze the actual and proposed practices, which he considers to be examples of best practices. Dr. Eshleman said that his task will be to determine which practices will work for Maryland and are the best of the best. Commissioner Kupfer said the Commission should be clear on the actual task and not overregulate. For example, the most protective "practice" might be to not allow drilling at all, but surely that is not the goal.

Dr. Eshleman said the task of his group is not to say whether an activity is too harmful and should not be done at all, but to determine the best practices for Maryland. Being reasonable is part of finding the best practice. An audience member commented that they should be called best practical practices.

Ms. Kenney said that Dr. Eshleman will compile a list of practices and recommend a set of practices that will be most protective for Maryland. The Commission will consider the recommendations, select best practices and give an opinion whether gas exploration and production using these practices would or would not present an unacceptable risk.

Dr. Eshleman said that his group will determine what is relevant, but will also be the most protective. He agreed with Ms. Kenney that it is not his call to finally select the practices, but his team will determine what is maximally protective and that ultimately it will only be one opinion.

Commissioner Weber asked what will guide the Commission in determining what is acceptable. Will the recommendations of the Commission only be based on the personal opinions of the commissioners? Commissioner Roberts commented that unacceptable risk may become a big issue as the Commission moves forward. Dr. Eshleman said that the recommendations will be which practices are the best, such as recommending which

areas will be excluded because of threatened species, etc. Commissioner Roberts said his point is that it is the regulators' job to determine which practices are best.

Ms. Kenney said that Dr. Eshleman's two deliverables are on a schedule that will allow the commission to discuss them and by December the Commission will develop a recommendation of BMPs that will be incorporated into a draft report on BMPs. Dr. Eshleman's report will be a starting point for the Commission's discussion and the draft report will be subject to comment. Those comments will be considered and a final report will be issued by August 2013. The regulatory process will then have another level of review.

An audience member asked whether the drilling processes and topography of other states are so different that the practices may not translate to Maryland. How will Dr. Eshleman be able to derive BMPs from other states, especially if other states use vertical drilling and not horizontal drilling? How is looking at a state like Colorado relevant to Maryland? Dr. Eshleman said Colorado is the only state his group is studying outside of the region. He said there was an Intermountain Oil and Gas BMP Project aimed at trying to develop uniform standards for this western region, but in the east there is no such effort.

Commissioner Weber asked about permitting BMPs. Ms. Kenney answered that there is a difference between the practice and how it would be mandated through permit. Dr. Eshleman's task isn't concerned with how BMPs will be implemented. Commissioner Weber commented a lot of work would have to be done to coordinate the regulations and permitting for air, water, drilling, etc. Ms. Kenney said that MDE has a work group that includes representatives of all the relevant programs, and that this coordination is a topic they are working on.

The commissioners then considered the minutes of the May meeting. One correction was made and the meetings were then voted on and approved unanimously.

Chairman Vanko then moved to discussion of legislation in 2013. Ms. Kenney read aloud a letter from the Chair of the Environmental Matters Committee, Delegate Maggie McIntosh. The Committee requested the formation of a workgroup during the interim to make recommendations for a comprehensive SOPA and for best practices for managing waste from hydraulic fracturing activities. The Committee further requested that Delegate Shane Robinson be included in the workgroup. Ms. Kenney said that Senator Conway requested to be the Senate representative in the workgroup.

There was some discussion of the make up and the role of the workgroup, and how it would relate to the Commission. Senator Edwards expressed concern that the workgroup might circumvent the Commission. Ms. Kenney indicated that this was not the intention. She would discuss the workgroup concept with Secretaries Summers and Griffin and come back to the Commission with a plan at the next meeting. It is anticipated that some Commissioners will serve on the workgroup.

Commissioner Valentine asked if the legislation for 2013 will be put together into a comprehensive package. Ms. Kenney said that there will be a comprehensive package that will probably be made up of several bills. Drafting of legislation is a special skill, and is not easily accomplished by a group. In response to a question about whether BMPs should be in legislation, Ms. Kenney said that it is preferable for such details to be in the regulations rather than in legislation.

Commissioner Fritts asked if the list from the legislative discussion at the May meeting will be available. Ms. Kenney noted that the list is attached to the May minutes and is publicly available. Senator Edwards commented that not all of the issues that were discussed in light of possible legislation would necessarily go to the Environmental Matters Committee, and Chairman Vanko suggested that it would make sense if the workgroup looked only at those items from the commission's list that are relevant to the Environmental Matters Committee. Ms. Kenney said she doesn't think the workgroup should be limited in that way. Senator Edwards said that there was a risk that the workgroup and the Commission would have inconsistent recommendations. Ms. Kenney said that this is not the intention and the workgroup will try to avoid that. Chairman Vanko commented that the workgroup is supposed to work in consultation to the Commission. He said the Commission should see any draft bills and have opportunity to weigh in. Lisa Nissley of MDE said she thought Delegate McIntosh's request for a workgroup reflected her opinion that a few people working in a focused, concentrated way on legislation would be more efficient than a large group, not that the workgroup would work separately or in opposition to the Commission. Commissioner Bender commented that he wants the Commission to be productive. He asked for more structure in the meetings, and that the decisions of the Commission be more clearly stated and communicated to the public.

Commissioner Murray commented that the workgroup could produce bill language that would accurately reflect the views of the Commission. In the 2012 session, numerous bills were introduced that the Commission had not specifically recommended or even discussed. Commissioner Bender commented that where there were disagreements among the Commissioners, a vote should be taken and recorded to document the different positions.

Commissioner Roberts said that the bills in the 2012 legislative session were introduced without consulting the Commission and this workgroup could hopefully resolve that issue. Commissioner Valentine said that the Commission cannot stop any Delegate or Senator from introducing legislation, but suggested the Commission review each bill and then comment on it. Members of the Commission should testify on the bills.

Chairman Vanko reflected on the task of determining the Commission's position on various issues. In the Commission's December report, Appendix E, entitled "Consultation with the Advisory Commission," it was reported that while there was consensus on some issues, on others there was disagreement within the Commission. Votes aren't helpful if an issue is known to be controversial within the Commission. The Commissioners need to say what the points of view are on the issue and move it forward.

Commissioner Bender said that the media mistakenly portrays some issues as having the full support of the Commission. Commissioner Roberts suggested that the Commission issue press releases. Chairman Vanko commented that it is important that the Commission, as a Commission, speaks with one voice. He said any Commissioner should feel free to write a letter to the editor or go to the media and communicate his or her own opinion on a matter, taking care not to represent it as the opinion of the Commission on controversial issues.

Chairman Vanko then initiated discussion of upcoming meetings. He stated the next two meetings are scheduled for July 20th and August 17th, and suggested the Appalachian Lab in Frostburg as a possible meeting site. There was general support for holding the meetings in Garrett or Allegany Counties.

Chairman Vanko then introduced the issue of site visits. The Susquehanna River Basin Commission (SRBC) had offered to arrange site visits, but their sites are far from Western Maryland. Chairman Vanko commented that Commissioner Kupfer mentioned Chevron might invite the Commission to a drill site in lieu of the July meeting. Commissioner Kupfer clarified that the visit could be either in lieu of the meeting or could occur the week after. It depends on what the group wants to do. The Commission could see a drill site, a hydraulic fracturing site and a reclaimed site in 4-5 hours. A meeting and a site visit in the same day probably wouldn't work.

Commissioner Roberts suggested visiting a place where people are dealing with the impacts of hydraulic fracturing. He offered to put this visit together. Chairman Vanko suggested that the Commission could do multiple trips and that a citizen's group in West Virginia offered for the Commission to visit. He commented the best way to formulate opinions is to look at all sides. Commissioner Kupfer said the Chevron sites would be in Uniontown, Pennsylvania area. Commissioner Roberts said the Commission should visit impacted communities at the same time. Commissioner Roberts said if the site visit will be in lieu of a meeting, July is a good time. Chairman Vanko said that the tentative plan for July was to examine what other states are doing. Commissioner Kupfer had agreed to discuss his experiences as a member of the Pennsylvania Governor's Marcellus Shale Advisory Commission, and Commissioner Weiss had agreed to talk about the legislation that resulted from the Advisory Commission's report. New York may not have completed its Environmental Impact Statement by July, so it might be premature to invite a representative of New York. Ms. Kenney supported substituting a site visit for the July meeting and mentioned Lieutenant Governor Brown is interested in seeing these sites, and that the Commission might want to invite him.

Commissioner Roberts again suggested meeting with an impacted community during the site visit. It was suggested that Commissioner Roberts identify a group and determine the feasibility of combining the meeting with the site visit. Commissioner Weber suggested getting a community group to gather someplace near the Chevron sites and share experiences in one location.

Senator Edwards suggested having Commission meetings on Monday through Thursday instead of Friday, having evening meetings, and switching the locations between Garrett and Allegheny Counties. Commissioner Raley suggested moving the date of the August meeting because he and Commissioner Valentine, and perhaps others, will be attending the annual meeting of the Maryland Association of Counties.

Chairman Vanko then opened the meeting to public comment. Chairman Vanko also said that comments can be made on the Marcellus Shale Safe Drilling Initiative Site on the MDE website.

James “Smokey” Stanton, a Garrett County resident, extended an invitation to all to the Youghiogheny River Watershed Association’s June 26 meeting at 7:30 p.m. at Garrett College. Dave Bolton of the Maryland Geological Survey (MGS) will describe the work MGS will do in Garrett County, sampling some domestic drinking water wells for methane. Stanton also requested that, if the Commission forms workgroups, that the meetings be announced and minutes posted online.

Amy Faby , a resident of Frostburg, spoke about “acceptable risk.” She does not want to be subjected to any risk due to fracking. Chairman Vanko said that a report issued by an new institute at the University of Buffalo analyzed violations related to 4,000 fracking jobs, and found 25 significant events, such as a major spill or a well blowout. If Maryland ultimately had 1500 or 1600 hydraulic fracturing locations and experienced the same proportion of events, there would be about 9 or 10 significant events. The job of the Commission is to determine what can be done to get the violations near zero, but you can only get near zero since there is always risk. His hope is to take an industry that has a fairly good track record and require the best performance so the risk is really small. That’s where the Commission is headed, but they have two more years. Commissioner Roberts said the study Vanko is citing shows a low percentage of major violations, but that the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection has documented a 2% failure rate for well casings, and other non-governmental organizations have estimated 6%. Commissioner Roberts said this risk is too high. If we can’t get to zero risk, what compensation will be provided to those who are harmed? If elected officials are willing to accept a risk, they should explain that to their constituents.

An audience member commented that many violations are not discovered because inspections are not frequent or comprehensive enough. She doesn’t trust industry to self-report and thinks the number of violations is much higher.

Eric Robison, a resident of Garrett County, said that he would like to be part of the legislative workgroup, and that he wants the Commission to review and weigh in on proposed legislation. He thanked the commission for having meetings in Garrett County and said evening meetings might bring more people out. He appreciates the work of the departments, the administration, and the Commission.

Gino Frazier, a Cumberland resident, expressed his concern about the effects of natural gas extraction on public health. Is it possible to assess that risk and what is the acceptable

level of risk of sickness or death? Chairman Vanko acknowledged that the public health issues are complicated and that little research has been completed on this issue. Public health will be the topic of a future Commission meeting.

Dana Shimrock, a Garrett County resident, commented it is unfortunate that public health information isn't available. Gag orders and settlement agreements that prevent people who have settled claims against gas companies from talking about their claims are partly to blame. She commended the Commission for bringing in officials to share information and for not rushing the process. With each meeting she recognizes how complex the issues are. She commented that 25/4000 major violations statistic was too many if the violations occurred on her land. She thanked the Commission for taking time and doing it right.

Matia Vanderbilt, a small business owner, commented that she had to close her business to attend this meeting. She is encouraged by the idea of a workgroup working on legislation because it becomes too politicized once it gets to the Legislature. She asked the Commission to consider the negative impact of gas extraction in Marcellus Shale. Plenty of information was given about the potential benefits but not the negatives. She said the Chamber of Commerce did a survey on tourism in 2009 and found that many people would decide not to vacation in Garrett County if drilling was allowed, with the associated traffic. She wants to make sure the Commission understands the negative economic impacts and effect on property values and second homes. She suggested looking at baseline economic situation now. Commissioner Roberts suggested that someone from the Department of Business and Economic Development could give presentation on that issue. Chairman Vanko commented that this type of study would have been done if the fee bill had passed in 2012. Ms. Kenney noted that the Executive Order states that the positive and negative economic impacts must be examined. There may be ways to look at the economic impacts using staff from the Department of Business and Economic Development and students from the Governor's Intern Program.

Billy Bishoff discussed the benefits of hydraulic fracturing including heat and shelter people for millions in the country, a shift of the political balance in the Middle East. He asked the Commission to consider what would happen if hydraulic fracturing is banned. He said oil prices will go up and the U.S. will send troops to the Middle East to establish stability there. He commented that no one has died from hydraulic fracturing. He said the industry is fundamentally changing that economic situation of the country. He suggested a workgroup is premature; it should wait until the Commission comes up with recommendations. Just because the workgroup was suggested doesn't mean it has to be formed. He said that Maryland is taking too much time to extract gas while it is being done elsewhere in other states and countries. He suggested looking at Texas and the results of the regulations employed there. He said studying New York is useless because little gas extraction has been done there. New York is theorizing about what is safe, but Texas engineers can prove what is safe. He questioned the value of including Colorado in the BMP study. Chairman Vanko commented that significant horizontal drilling has begun lately in Colorado.

Commissioner Raley commented that the Garrett County Marcellus Shale Natural Gas Advisory Committee shares information with Garrett County residents. The group wants to keep the Garrett County severance tax. They have a website and put up the information from the Commission meetings. The group meets every other month in the evenings.

Barbara Pritts described her experience when approached with a lease offer for their land. Her lawyer recommended that she not lease the land, but rather sell it, because she would not want to live on it if drilling occurred. Neighbors who choose not to drill experience the impacts of drilling. She decided not to lease or sell. She pointed out a recent example of pollution caused by illegal dumping and mentioned the sickness caused by methane and benzene in the water. She suggested waiting for a better method of gas extraction before allowing it in Maryland. The Garrett County economy relies on farming and tourism. She is a realtor and thinks people will not buy land here if there are gas wells. She offered to give the Commission a copy of a newspaper article about loan applications being rejected because of gas drilling nearby.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:35 pm.